

**Remarks/Arguments**

In the October 25, 2004 Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,019 to Savaglio et al. (hereinafter "*Savaglio*") in view of U.S. No. 6,480,592 to Urban et al. (hereinafter "*Urban*"). The applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 16 and canceled claims 2-4, 8, and 14. For the reasons set forth below, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

**Independent Claim 1**

The applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the recitations of originally submitted dependent claims 2-4 and 8. The applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination does not teach, suggest, or describe the detailed process recited by amended independent claim 1. The combination does not teach "wherein the location information is encoded in binary coded decimal format" and "providing the location information from the signal switching point to mapping software within the called device for displaying the location of the calling party" as recited by claim 1.

In rejecting claim 8, the Office Action cites *Savaglio* as teaching location information encoded in binary coded decimal format. The cited portion of *Savaglio* states that the methods of *Savaglio* can be implemented as computer-readable instructions. The applicant respectfully submits that computer-readable instructions for retrieving location information is not equivalent to teaching that the location information is encoded in binary coded decimal format as recited by claim 1. Further, *Savaglio* and *Urban* fail to describe providing location information to mapping software for displaying the location of the calling party. For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over *Savaglio* in view of *Urban*.

**Independent Claim 10**

The applicant has amended claim 1 to more clearly reflect one aspect of the present invention. The applicant respectfully submits that *Savaglio* in combination with *Urban* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 10. In particular, the combination does not teach "wherein the location information comprises

planar coordinates” as recited by claim 10. The cited art does not teach location information comprising planar coordinates. In rejecting dependent claim 14, the Office Action suggests that *Savaglio* teaches the location information as being planar coordinates in column 3, lines 29-30, which states that the location information is transmitted to the operator. However, “location information” does not suggest the specific “planar coordinates” recitation of claim 10.

Further, *Savaglio* does not teach location information comprising planar coordinates “encoded in a format wherein each decimal number of the planar coordinates is represented by a nibble” as recited by claim 10. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 1, the cited art does not describe any specific encoding format of the stored location information. For at least these reasons, independent claim 10 is allowable over *Savaglio* in view of *Urban*.

#### Independent Claim 16

The applicant has amended claim 16 to more clearly reflect one aspect of the present invention. The applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 16. In particular, the cited art does not describe or suggest “geographic informational system software operative to utilize the location information to provide directions to the calling party” as recited by claim 16. For at least the reason that both *Savaglio* and *Urban* fail to describe geographic informational system software, independent claim 16 is allowable over *Savaglio* in view of *Urban*.

#### Dependent Claims 5-7, 9, 11-13, 15, and 17-20

Because *Savaglio* fails to teach, suggest, or describe the recitations of claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-20 and because claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-20 depend from allowable independent claims 1, 10, and 16, dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, and 17-20 are allowable over *Savaglio*.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



Leonard J. Hope

Reg. No.: 44,774

Date: January 24, 2005

Merchant & Gould  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
Telephone: 404.954.5100

